



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,412	07/07/2003	Takeshi Nakao	36856.1101	7478
7590	05/14/2004		EXAMINER	
Keating & Bennet LLP Suite 312 10400 Eaton Place Fairfax, VA 22030			NGUYEN, TAI V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3729	

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/614,412	NAKAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tai Van Nguyen	3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/964,831.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/07/03, 01/30/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. Following title is suggested: A MEHTOD FOR MANUFACTURING A SURFACE ACOUSTIC WAVE DEVICE USING A SHEAR HORIZONTAL TYPE.
3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

- Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
 - (2) if an article, its method of making;
 - (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
 - (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
 - (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is not drawn to the claimed invention, i. e. method. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 25 –29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto et al (US 5,953,433) in view of Abe (5,850,167).

As applied to claim 25, Fujimoto et al disclose using a Shear Horizontal type surface acoustic wave, comprising the steps of: preparing a quartz substrate (2a, Fig. 1A); forming a metal film (2) having a larger mass-load effect than that of aluminum on the quartz substrate; and patterning the metal film to form at least one interdigital transducer (3, 4).

Fujimoto does not teach a lift-off process such that a metallization ratio “d” and a normalized film thickness h/λ of the at least one interdigital transducer which makes a spurious transversal mode ripple to be about 1.5 dB or less are satisfied, where “d” is the metallization ratio of the interdigital transducer, “ λ ” is the film thickness of the interdigital transducer. Abe teaches a lift-off process such that a metallization ratio “d” and a normalized film thickness h/λ of the at least one interdigital transducer which makes a spurious transversal mode ripple to be about 1.5 dB or less are satisfied, where “d” is the metallization ratio of the interdigital transducer, “ λ ” is the film thickness of the interdigital transducer (column 22, lines 19 ff). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at this time the invention was made to modify the method of

Fujimoto et al to provide metallization ratio of the interdigital transducer as taught Abe, for using intermediate frequency filters for high achievement.

As applied to claims 26-29, the metal film is made from tantalum or tungsten of Fujimoto can be set at various normalized thickness of h/λ (column 5, line 62 ff).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai Van Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-308-1791. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 703-308-1789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/614,412
Art Unit: 3729

Page 5

TN
May 10, 2004



A. DEXTER TUGBANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER